New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements
Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1920.

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Ogden Reid, President; O. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary; R. E. Mansfield, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By mail, including Postage, IN THE UNITED STATES.

East of Mississippi River: By Mail, Postpaid.	One Year.	Six Months.	One Month.
Daily and Sunday	$12.00	$6.00	$1.00
One week 35c.			
Daily only	10.00	5.00	.85
One week, 30c.			
Sunday only	4.00	2.25	.40
Sunday only, Canada	6.00	3.25	.60
FOREIGN RATES			
Daily and Sunday	$26.00	$13.30	$2.40
Daily only	17.40	8.70	1.65
Sunday only	8.75	5.13	.85

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

GUARANTY

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

A Confession

President Wilson, having challenged the accuracy of the French official text of his speech in the peace conference on May 31, 1919, now presents not the official English text, of which he admits possessing a copy, but a private version offered by F. A. Carlson, an American stenographer, who was present.

The Carlson text, although more circumlocutory than the translation of the French text, fully supports Senator Spencer. The only difference between it and the text used by Senator Spencer is microscopic. One speaks of the obligation on the United States to send her armies over the sea to protect the Rumanians and the Serbs, while the other acknowledges that the Rumanians and Serbs expected American assistance and argues that because of this expectation the settlement must be such as the United States would be willing to guarantee.

By not challenging the validity of the expectation, and referring to it as a reason why his hearers should accept his advice, the President, of course, indorsed it. To say otherwise would be to accuse him of an argumentative trick.

The President presented the assurances of military support to be given the Rumanian and Serbian states as entitling the major powers to ask for a *quid pro quo*—namely, the concession by Rumania and Serbia of racial minority guaranties. That was the whole purpose of the President's argument.

The major powers were enlarging Rumanian and Serbian territory and obligating themselves to respect and defend the new boundaries against external aggression (the specific pledge to do so being contained in Article X of the covenant of the league). Why, then, the President insisted, shouldn't Rumania and Serbia accept minority guaranty limitations on their sovereignty as a fair offset to the military protection which they were to enjoy?

The Carlson record is thus in meaning in full accord with the French official version. It shows that the major powers intended to guarantee the peace settlements by military force. This is exactly what Senator Spencer declared.

The retranslation of the French official version into English is phrased a little differently from the Carlson version. But there is no difference in meaning or intent. In the Carlson version quite as much as in the other the President uses the Rumanian and Serbian expectation of the arrival of the American army and navy in order to clinch his *quid pro quo* demand. Did he intimate that such an expectation was unjustified? He could not and did not. On May 31, 1919, he was talking without afterthought, giving his original and natural interpretation of the meaning of the guaranties of Article X. And this article, of course, now has exactly the meaning it had when the President expounded its beauties to the Rumanians and Serbs, though then he said to all small nations that if they would agree to the peace conditions the big powers insisted on, then the big powers, including the United States, would go to war in their behalf.

The Truth About Rheims

Perhaps it was to be expected that in time the Germans would convict themselves out of their own mouths concerning the bombardment of the Rheims Cathedral. Anyway, the conviction has come in the reminiscences of Baron Hausen.

The excuse of General von Bülow was that the French were using the towers of the cathedral for an observation post. Even if this had been true, the attempt to destroy one of the great monuments of the Middle Ages, a shrine of peculiar sacredness to France, would have deserved condemnation. The warring hordes of a far less civilized time respected Rheims. But General von Bülow's excuse was a mere subterfuge.

Baron Hausen was the commander of the Saxon army. It was after his hussars had entered Rheims and the French had withdrawn that von Bülow began the indiscriminate shelling of the city. Baron Hausen, protesting, was told that this was a reprisal for the detention by the French of a Prussian *parlementaire*. Having no faith in this assertion, Baron Hausen caused a careful investigation to be made, from which the fact developed that no Prussian *parlementaire* had ever been in Rheims. It was sheer barbarism that dictated the bombardment. Even the peril involved to German troops could not avert von Bülow's Berserker rage.

The Rheims brutality was only one, of course, of many similar instances, though the circumstances made it more conspicuous than most. Germany went into the war fully resolved to carry out to the letter all the infamous instructions in her official war book. Yet even a German cannot quite escape a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. The effect of German savagery upon the rest of the world could not be wholly ignored. It was necessary to invent reasons for shameful acts. The reason for the bombardment of Rheims was no less plausible or more untruthful than the rest.

Why Vote for Harding?

Desperate by reason of the score chalked up against them, Messrs. Wilson and Cox, Siamese twins of politics, are making a feverish effort to stimulate a ninth-inning rally.

The old properties, frayed and worn, are exhibited. The lacerated heart of the world; the Wilson league, the blessed Wilson league which the President holds he can kill in March and have alive in November; the bones of Article X, the remakable reversible article which one audience is told commits us to nothing and the next that it commits us to everything.

And what do the people say, as they turn away from this beating of dilapidated tin cans? That they intend to vote for Harding.

(1) Because they are sick of personal government. They have had eight years of it. It is enough!

(2) Because they are tired of incapacity in high places, of the genius for mess and muddle which the Wilson Administration has disclosed. The spectacle of mental meagerness strutting around in the clothes of authority makes a dull "movie." Only little men would have endured errand boy treatment and little men are costly.

(3) Because, with respect to foreign relations, they have confidence in Harding for the promises he does not make. Exact pledges could be easily made, but unless willing to play autocrat Senator Harding knows he could not redeem them. The Senate exists. It will exist after March 4. The vote of two-thirds of its membership is necessary to ratify a treaty. The only chance of realization of the league idea is in free consultation with the Senate.

(4) Because of Cox.

Draft Injustices

In executing the conscription act of 1917 the War Department nullified the law which ordered the draft apportionment to be based on population. It was apparent at the time that the apportionment enforced by Secretary Baker was scandalously unjust and discriminatory, but the inequalities went uncorrected.

The announcement of the population totals of the states permits a comparison between the fictitious draft population figures imposed by the War Department and the actual population figures. The department had available in 1917 the estimates of population which the census bureau issues annually. These are not very trustworthy. It also had at hand the various state censuses of 1915. But it chose to disregard all these and to obtain its draft population totals by the simple method of multiplying the registration figures of each state by an arbitrarily fixed integer. It thereby put a premium on under-registration and imposed a penalty on full registration.

This system worked out to the exclusive benefit of Democratic states, where registration was conducted slackly. The extent of this sectional discrimination is now apparent.

Here are some of the most glaring examples. Arkansas had a population in 1910 of 1,574,449. Its draft population was put at 1,594,835. Its population in 1920 is 1,750,995. Tennessee's population in 1910 was 2,184,789, her draft population was fixed at 2,024,893 and her 1920 population is 2,337,459. Kentucky's figures were: 1910, 2,289,905; 1917, 2,024,353; 1920, 2,416,013. Alabama's figures were: 1910, 2,138,093; 1917, 1,946,536; 1920, 2,347,295. Mississippi had 1,797,114 inhabitants in 1910, was credited with only 1,501,345 in 1917, and had 1,789,354 in 1920. Louisiana had 1,656,388 in 1910, was credited with 1,688,862 in 1917 and had 1,797,798 in 1920. Georgia's 1910 total was 2,609,121. It decreased to 2,486,544 in 1917 and skyrocketed back to 2,893,955 in 1920.

South Carolina's also showed a mysterious falling off for war purposes and a quick recovery after the armistice. Her total in 1910 was 1,515,400, in 1917 1,384,208 and in 1920 1,683,662. North Carolina was similarly affected. Her total was 2,206,287 in 1910. It fell to 2,146,266 in 1917 and soared to 2,556,486 in 1920. Virginia had 2,061,612 inhabitants in 1910, was credited with only 1,951,521 in 1917 and had 2,306,361 in 1920.

In contrast with the artificially decreased draft totals of these states many Northern states bore a grossly exaggerated burden. New York's population in 1917 was put by the War Department at 11,187,798. Its real population three years later was only 10,384,144. Pennsylvania's draft figure was 8,981,682, her population in 1920 8,720,159. Michigan's artificial 1917 total was 4,015,053. Her census return in 1920 was only 3,667,322. Ohio's draft population was 6,074,771; her real population three years later was 5,759,368. Connecticut was saddled with an enormous draft population of 1,719,623. Her census total in 1920 was only 1,380,365. Illinois was credited with 7,227,952 inhabitants in 1917. In 1920 she had only 6,485,098.

These extraordinary sectional over-drafts and under-drafts vitiated the purpose of the universal service law, which is based on equality of obligation. The law couldn't have been administered any more effectively toward the end secured if it had contained a clause giving Democrats exemption and compelling Republican states to make good the deficits.

Because a Man of Sense

Washington expresses curiosity as to why former President Taft is not supporting Cox on the league issue. Mr. Taft's good humor is celebrated. Yet his laugh must come a little slowly over the impudence of the query.

Mr. Taft was an advocate of general arbitration treaties, international peace organizations and of a league to enforce peace when President Wilson was shouting for a hermitlike isolation and thanking God for the 3,000 miles of cool ocean that separated us from Europe. Many hours Mr. Taft labored to open the mind of Woodrow to the peace thought. It is trying for a teacher to find himself rebuked for backwardness by one long at the foot of the class.

Why does Mr. Taft not support Cox? Because he is a man of sense. He knows that the surest way to prevent entry into any sort of a league is to elect Cox; that there is about as much chance of an airplane flight to Jupiter as to get the Senate to ratify the Wilson covenant as written. To get two-thirds of the Senate to swallow the Wilson plan whole, as Cox demands, is not in the realm of possibilities.

Mr. Taft wants a league. He would have the United States as a member of it. He is not bothering about personal credit or partisanship. He did not object to Article X until it appeared that its presence prevented ratification. When it was manifest that it was a Jonah as a rational person he recognized the need of sacrificing personal views and first choices.

As to the future Mr. Taft sees plainly enough that it will be difficult to get two-thirds of the Senate for any part of the bedeviled Wilson project. This leads him to recognize the weight of practical arguments in favor of making some sort of new start. Perhaps it is not logical to prefer a new label, but it is human.

So Mr. Taft is not for Cox—perceives that so far as a league is concerned he leads the way to a slaughterhouse.

Lookers and Looked At

A great deal of brain power and debate is being devoted to the indictment drawn by a correspondent of the Mayor's charging the short skirt with the slaughter of gaping males mown down by automobiles upon our streets. The accuser offered no moral judgment in the premises and left the question in doubt as to whether he considered the skirt guilty of wanton homicide or the gaper guilty of sinful negligence. He merely asserted the fact.

The answer to the letter, as indeed to all those critics of the Parisian mode now belatedly conquering these shores, is simply to point out the fact that cynosures are necessarily short lived, born to die and gone before you can fairly get your moral sentiments in type. Perhaps a gaper or two did get run down in the first hours of the short skirt. But to-day a dozen blocks on Fifth Avenue are enough to reduce any pedestrian to the status of the most blasé of Fifth Avenue bus drivers, as portrayed in the ancient jest to the effect that ankles were no treat to such as he. If there are any, in this respect, unsophisticated souls still at large in our town they must be wearing blinders.

Thus both the moral and the homicidal aspect of the short skirt will not bear analysis. Rather, we suggest, is the indictment now to be shifted to the long skirt—become the cynosure of all eyes and the subject of endless speculation. What is newly revealed can be a nine-day wonder. What is concealed is an eternal mystery that deepens into the source of the liveliest curiosity when the concealment is exceptional and contrary to the custom of the day. Therefore, if our philosophers wish to write to the Mayor, let them inveigh against the long skirt and insist upon a municipal ordinance requiring that all skirts be a fixed number of inches above the pavement. His Honor is a great believer in the city's capacity to do almost anything, and who knows but that the municipally regulated skirt might be welcomed to his program?

Calvin Coolidge Says

(From his speech accepting the Republican nomination for Vice-President, July 27, 1920)

Another source of the gravest public concern has been the reactionary tendency to substitute private will for the public will. Instead of inquiring what the law was and then rendering it full obedience, there has been a disposition on the part of some individuals and of groups to inquire whether they liked the law, and, if not, to disregard it, seek to override it, suspend it and prevent its execution, sometimes by the method of direct action, for the purpose of securing their own selfish ends. The observance of the law is the greatest solvent of public ills.

Men speak of natural rights, but I challenge any one to show where in nature any rights ever existed or were recognized until there was established for their declaration and protection a duly promulgated body of corresponding laws. The march of civilization has been ever under the protecting ægis of the law. It is the strong defense of the weak, the ever-present refuge of innocence, a mighty fortress of the righteous. One with the law is a majority. While the law is observed the progress of civilization will continue. When such observance ceases chaos and the ancient night of despotism will come again. Liberty goes unsupported or relies in its entirety on the maintenance of order and the execution of the law.

Cox's Newspaper Says

(From The Dayton Daily News, October 6, 1916)

If Justice Hughes should be elected, he would, if he is a man of conscience, take Germany to task for the sinking of the Lusitania. He would even at this late day, if he is a man of conscience, protest to Germany against her occupation of Belgium. It would be too late to oppose her invasion of Belgium, but Germany is still occupying Belgium, and if, as Mr. Roosevelt says, and as Mr. Hughes approves, the United States should have protested against the invasion, she should also protest now against occupation.

It is said that if Justice Hughes is elected President Theodore Roosevelt will be made Secretary of State. In fact, it is generally understood that such will be the case; it has frequently been mentioned and never denied. Theodore Roosevelt's first act as Secretary of State would be to give Germany so many hours to get out of Belgium. Mark that. He wouldn't be Secretary a week until a formal notice would be sent to Germany with a time limit to get out of Belgium. Germany would, of course, refuse, and the government of this country would have nothing to do but to attempt to put her out. A state of war would exist; that is all there is to it. There is one choice as against peace, and that is war.

The Harding "League of Peace"

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: My reading of Senator Harding's speeches is that he would substitute for Mr. Wilson's proposed supergovernment of the world a league of peace—an association of nations, each whereof agrees that it will not attack the other. This is far removed from the conception of force which is presented to us in the guise of a League of Nations.

America has always been ready, will always be ready, to join a league of peace. Has ever sought to make such agreements with other nations. But America must, if she would continue to preserve her integrity and indeed her very existence, avoid all leagues founded upon the theory that she shall maintain with her force one or the other side in all the quarrels of other nations. To epigrammatize it one might say: Whenever there is a league of peace to join America will join it. So long as there is a League of Nations to avoid America will avoid it.

The two conceptions differ fundamentally. The first is, in legal phrase, a "several undertaking," the other a "joint obligation."

The other nations recognize and respect America's view in this respect and have so indicated, and no fears need be entertained of any of the dire results with which we are threatened if we "stay out" of the covenant; they are bugaboos to frighten children with.

CHAS. STEWART DAVISON.
New York, Oct. 10, 1920.

Butter Up and Down

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Reports of commodity prices state that while many other things are lower butter prices are higher.

This is true only on the surface. While about 5 per cent of the supply of butter is higher in price than is usual at this time of the year, 95 per cent of the wholesale butter supply is offering at the lowest price in over twelve months.

As an illustration, good grades of fresh firsts are offering in the wholesale market in practically unlimited quantities at 50c. to 52c. Yesterday this grade of butter (storage standards) sold for December delivery in Chicago at 51½c., which means about 49c. to 50c. net on account of carrying charges.

The fact is that the butter industry in this country is in a practically demoralized condition, and both manufacturers and dealers face very heavy losses. F. F. LOWENFELS & SON.
New York, Oct. 9, 1920.

The Conning Tower

THE GROANING BARD

In Lord Macaulay's noble work
I chanced to read this bit of news:
That Warren Hastings wrote a pome
Each morn before he donned his shoes,
And at the matutinal board
He read it while the tea was poured.

Sometimes it was a madrigal,
Sometimes it took the sonnet's form;
The briefish epic, too, was tried—
Whate'er it was it caused a storm
Of wild applause to rend the air
Surrounding those assembled there.

And if, for cause, he failed to bring
His morning verse—but that was rare—
His matutinal board was sad—
Gloom hit the bunch assembled there.
In Lord Macaulay's book I read
All this good stuff, as I have said.

I rather like old Hastings's stunt—
'Twas quite a clever thing to do.
Nor could I read at breakfast time
Some pome—but, Boss, it's up to you.
And if I don't—what gloom, what gloom
Will fill our little breakfast room!

THESPIS.

Little did we dream that we ever would be a crafty politician; but Saturday night we plied a potential Cox voter with food until he forgot to register.

The esteemed Cleveland team, apparently, is doing it for the Wives and the Kids.

THE INSOMNIACS

A bunch of the boys were whooping it up
With Edna St. Vincent Millay.

WILLIAM T. TILDEN, 3ND.

* * *

How happy could I be with either
Were Edna St. Vincent Millay.

C. W. W.

* * *

The breaking waves dashed high
On Viola Brothers Shore.

Just tell them that you saw me, Viola Brothers Shore.
Just tell them I'm Viola Brothers Shore.
Just whisper, if you get a chance, "Viola Brothers Shore."
I love her as Viola Brothers Shore.

She was happy till she met you,
Was Viola Brothers Shore.

VIOLA BROTHERS SHORE.

Opening letters containing attempted additions to "The Insomniacs" is cutting into our slumber hours, so the series is ended. It is not, as the poet says, always Millay.

Another grave without victory may be hoped for by the patrons of Fairchild Sons, Brooklyn funeral directors, who advertise "The dignified and capable manner in which a funeral can be cared for at our chapel makes it very desirable."

The Diary of Our Own Samuel Pepys

October 9—To the courts with C. Merz, and beat him easily enough, five setts; but W. Jones beat me two setts in three; after which I could play only doubles, and S. Spaeth and I had good success. Home, and I brought some dinner with me, of roast chicken, and we had a merry time of it, I playing for my wife and Katharine on my new concertina.

10—Met with S. Spaeth, and played lawn tennis with him, and he beat me; and so took my wife for a ride, and to dinner, and early home, and worked until 11; and read in A. Bennett's "Our Women," an interesting book, but as to the soundness of his theories I know nought.

11—All day at the office, going there by subway, my wife having driven to Yonkers in the petrol-waggon, to make some jelly against the winter.

"Who," the young man asked us, "writes that page in The Sun?"

"Which page?" was our question.

"This one here," said the young man.

"That," we said, paternally, "is only a column—one-eighth of a page."

"Well, you know what I mean," he flattered.

"What is the use of signing a column day after day, for years?" we asked, "if you don't know who does it?"

"Well," he said, "who does it?"

"This man," we pointed to Don Marquis's name.

"Who's he?" asked the tennis player.

"He's the man who writes that column," we said to the registered voter.

Face the East, and Pray

Sir: Why all this craze for lucidity, anyway? Why must you want to know "In what subject?" and "What were the questions?" First thing we know we'll know everything. In the window of a book store on Fifth Avenue there is a painting "by one of America's greatest painters," and it is said to be a portrait of a "Charles Dickens." Should not the sign read: "Portrait of an Englishman by one of America's greatest painters"? Of course, everybody knows who Dickens was. He used to be a newspaper man himself, didn't he? Now, I suppose you will want to know who the painter was.

But I am strong for better blurbs on book jackets. I went in one of our best book stores to get the latest book on Bringing Up Father, and Mutt and Jeff, entitled "Insect Adventures," which I saw in the window. Imagine my surprise when I found it was all about bugs and spiders and things, by a fellow named Fabre. What should I do?

TENNILLE.

On one of the wide benches . . . a man and woman were sitting. They had strolled slowly from the tennis court, where half a dozen young persons were violently exercising themselves.—From "Harriet and the Piper," by Kathleen Norris.

Mixed triples?

NOSTALGIA

In France, beside the sunny Loire,
A maiden fair to see,
Looks westward toward the setting sun,
And nightly thinks of me.

I met this maiden once a week,
Beside the rustic well,
And though we scarcely spoke a word,
My secrets she knew well.

She used to wash my soldier-clothes,
This laundress, young and thrifty;
And some day I'll go back, because
I owe her four francs fifty.

H. A. H.

We string along with our old C. O., Lieutenant Colonel Herbert Parsons, whose motto appears to be "Any one who scraps the League has got me to scrap."

Warren or James? Warren or James?
I'll watch the returns from the world's series games.

Who, we wonder, but for Christopher Columbus, would now be the 100 per cent red-blooded Americans?

F. P. A.

ANOTHER ONE OF THOSE SUBSTITUTES FOR GASOLINE THAT DOESN'T SEEM TO BE WORKING VERY WELL

The High Cost of Strikes

Chapter XI.

Striking for Monopoly Control of Necessaries by a Class

By Marshall Olds

(This is one of a series of thirteen articles appearing on this page daily.)

When Louis Fridiger, counsel for the B. R. T. union, was pleading passionately with the men not to begin the Brooklyn car strike his argument included nothing as to the best interests of the people of Brooklyn—it did not even discuss the best interests of the workers—his big argument and basic plea was that "such a strike will break up the best union in the country."

Louis Fridiger also made another remark at the same time which is as typical of the labor leader's attitude of to-day as "the public be damned" was typical of the trust baron's attitude a generation ago, when he warned labor not to pay any attention to government officials, "because their first duty is to the public."

More Power Than President

Neither the President of the United States nor any officer or group of officers in our entire government possesses the possibility of such power to injure all the rest of the people as is possessed and was exercised by the coal union leaders. The basis of that power is the fact that with the $11,000,000 a year dues they can maintain an organization that dominates an industry that is vital to the whole nation.

In Russia the small minority labor class to-day completely dominates the whole government. In Germany the labor class minority has a disproportionate voice of the government and has in certain crises absolutely dominated the policy of the government. In England the labor class minority is frankly and openly working toward the domination of the majority of the rest of the people.

Now the means by which labor minorities have dominated or sought to dominate in other countries has not been through orderly processes of government, but through getting control of the production of the necessaries of life and then threatening to cut off the necessaries of the people until they obtained the individual or class advantages which they sought.

Dominating the Government

Powerful labor leaders in America to-day have exactly such a control in the basic coal industry and exercised exactly this kind of control in the coal strike. The government itself ordered the union leaders to call the strike off. The leaders went through the form of sending telegrams to the local unions which did not and could not bear the official union seal without which, under union law, no union document is official. These telegrams, therefore, were not meant actually to call off the coal strike as the government ordered. They were not understood by the men as an order to call off the strike, but merely as a subterfuge, and they did not call off the coal strike. The government said it would not treat with the union leaders till the men had gone back to work. But the government did depose Mr. Garfield, the fuel administrator, from power at command of the union leaders and not only treated but made agreements with the union leaders before the men went back to work. The union leaders did not get all they tried to get out of the coal strike, but they did dominate the government itself sufficiently to make it back down from the position it had publicly taken.

Now it is perfectly obvious, if the organization of 500,000 men and the collection of $11,000,000 annual dues can give labor leaders such power through the control of the coal industry to use for their own or their class interests, that just in proportion as they can organize other great basic industries they will have just that much greater power with which to further their own or their mere class interests.

While the great majority of skilled workers, who are always able to keep their jobs and get good pay on their own merits, are generally union members and firm believers in unionism as a constructive force in industry, they have never been believers in the labor chauvinism of the German or Russian type that has been responsible for so many of our own most costly strikes since the war.

The big body of new and nondescript workers, on the other hand, who came into the unions in such numbers during the war and who feared that the end of the war meant the end of their war jobs and high war pay, became immediate converts to all forms of union radicalism and gave radical leaders of all types a weight of following which made it possible for them to get control in the union organizations in many of our greatest industries. In others it made them powerful enough to force the less radical leaders to adopt radical programs to keep their power.

The first big strike after the war to increase the power of unionism in a big basic industry, in which union leaders changed their policy of merely trying to keep the high war wages and for these strategic reasons demanded a big increase of wages, was the clothing strike.

Conservative Labor

It has long been a fundamental union policy to work for a more and more complete control of our big basic industries. But while unionism was under the control of conservative leaders who had a considerable respect for the power of public opinion, its methods were usually to go slow and wait for favorable opportunities. It generally let the workers themselves take the initiative, and if a cause for which they were striking was just and was otherwise susceptible, with the right kind of presentation, of getting public sympathy, the big amalgamated or federated unions would come in as the champions of the oppressed workers who were not strong enough to fight their own battles, and in that way build up their power in that industry.

But for the radical labor leaders who now dominate organized labor or are in sufficiently powerful positions to force conservative leaders into radical policies in order to keep their jobs this process is entirely too slow.

Formerly any group of labor could not be depended on to go immediately on strike because some outsider told them to strike for some grievance which they had never thought of themselves or for a union not yet in existence. But to-day the strike epidemic has become so widespread that great classes of labor will stop work on practically any pretext and on practically anybody's say-so.

Moreover, radical leaders think they have found out that the public will stand for almost anything, or at least is not organized or united enough to make its opinion count.

Finally, whereas under the old strategy of waiting till the workers had a real grievance and themselves took the initiative in striking it took years to completely organize an industry and to build up the power and the millions of dollars' income which the organization of great industries gives, radical labor leaders to-day do not see why, with labor's willingness to strike and the public's supineness, they cannot grab off a whole industry and make millions of dollars in dues available immediately at one stroke.

In fact, the idea is so intriguing to the imagination of powerful labor groups that they are to-day competing with each other for the privilege of attempting to organize certain great industries and are already fighting over the prospective spoils.

The Next Steel Strike

In its secret session at Atlantic City early in August the executive council of the American Federation of Labor mapped out a tremendous campaign to unionize the great steel industry next year. Several interesting facts have already leaked out. Thirty unions have been let in on the drive. The Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers at first refused to help such a movement unless it received a 51 per cent control of the organizing committee—which presumably meant 51 per cent of the power and the income if the drive went over. Whether this particular faction succeeded in getting these demands or not has not been announced. There is, of course, to be a large war fund used, of which Secretary Morrison refused to state the size. Nor did he say how it had been subscribed, how it was to be used or what promises had been made to those who subscribed it. Secretary Morrison, however, most casually and naively, did say: "I should not say that a strike is contemplated. I should rather say that organization is the objective."

In other words, the big steel industry, which is almost as important to the country as the coal industry, is next year to be the victim of tremendous labor agitation, artificially forced from outside. The men who are forcing this agitation are not themselves connected with the steel industry, nor have they been elected or given any authority we know of by the steel workers to represent them. They certainly do not represent the users of steel or the public in general. These men in their preliminary announcement, moreover, make no mention of any consideration of public interest. They make no mention of what it is proposed to do for the steel workers. They seem to be concerned chiefly with maneuvering and jockeying with each other for special preferred positions.

A Stranglehold

The last steel strike cost the public nearly $500,000,000. A bigger, better organized steel strike would probably cost the public far more than this.

But with, or perhaps without, a strike—it is admittedly merely a matter of strategy whether the public must bear the cost of a steel strike or not—there is the chance that labor leaders can get a stranglehold on another great basic American industry, through which they can still further threaten or punish the whole people as they have through their control of the coal industry; there is a chance that 500,000 new members may be brought under their control who would pay about $10,000,000 a year into treasuries they control. The public be damned!

(To-morrow's article: "Striking at the Roots of Americanism.")